

B1
cont'd

about a generally vertical axis to thereby permit said displays to be
angled relative to each other to a desired degree. 7

Remarks

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed Jan. 20, 2000. In that Office Action the reissue declaration was rejected as not being in full compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.175. As a result, claims 1-5, 17 and 18 were also rejected as being based on a defective reissue oath under 35 U.S.C. §251. Claims 17 and 18 were rejected as being of improper scope, in view of the recapture doctrine and the amendments made to the application from which the present reissue application is based.

Although the undersigned respectfully disagrees that the reissue declaration does not comply with the requirements under 37 C.F.R. §1.175, in the interest of expediting allowance of the application a new reissue declaration is being submitted, together with a Supplemental Declaration directed at changes made to the application subsequent to the filing of the present reissue application. It is believed that these two declarations obviate all grounds forming the basis for the previously given rejections, and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 17 and 18 have also been amended to include the limitation relating to the "base". This component is used to support the arm assembly above a work surface. It is believed that this places claims 17 and 18 in form for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that the entire application is in form for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If the examiner has any questions concerning this matter he is requested to contact the undersigned at the number below to discuss same.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
Attorney For Applicant

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Mark D. Elchuk". A checkmark is drawn above the signature.

Mark D. Elchuk
Reg. No. 33,686

P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600
MDE/jo
February 11, 2000